REMARKS

By this amendment, claims 14 and 19 have been amended. Claims 3-10,14-20 and 23-25 remain pending.

Amended claim 14 has corrected the inadvertent omission of language noticed by the Examiner, and is now believed to be proper under 35 U.S.C. §112.

The pending claims stand rejected over the following new grounds:

1. Claims 3-4, 6-8, 10, 19-20, 23 and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over Costin U.S. Patent Publication 2005/0131571 A1 in view of Berger *et al.* U.S. Patent No. 6,414,693 B1;
2. Claims 5, 9, 14-18 and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious from Costin and Berger *et al.* in further view of Knight U.S. Patent No. 6,344,853 B1.

Applicant respectfully asserts that the claims as amended and presented herein are allowable over the above references.

Specifically, while Costin teaches providing two view (front and back) in a display, the illustrations are clearly of a pair of jeans which are flat in a two dimensional configuration. As a result, whatever design element may be added to jeans in Costin will be visible in only one of the views. This is readily apparent from Fig. 5, which shows possible design locations 1-9 in the front view, and separate possible design locations 10-18 in the rear view. This is also clear from Figs. 7 and 10, which show example design elements which are visible on only one of the views.

Converting an item such as jeans, which obviously exists in three-dimensional space when worn, so as to display it in what is essentially only a two dimensional manner, will not give the observer any accurate representation of what the jeans (and particularly any added design on the jeans) will actually look like when worn. For example, while a straight-on view of a design on the front of a pant leg may give some feel for the appearance when worn, it will not provide any feedback for how the front design may look from the side. A design which may look acceptable when viewed straight-on may very well be unattractive and unacceptable when viewed from the side. The Costin structure will provide a user with no confidence that the design will look good from more than just the straight-on view.

This same drawback is present in Berger *et al.* Specifically, even though Berger *et al.* does show a perspective view representing a three-dimensional view of the object (handbag), the only view of the added design is a straight-on front view. Thus, Berger *et al.* also does not give the potential purchaser the option of seeing what a selected design will look like from more than just a straight-on view.

Knight is similarly lacking.

The claims as presented clearly recite this distinction.

Independent claim 3 recites a method for facilitating sale where, *inter alia*, the user inputs "are adapted to provide different perspective views of said object with said display element displayed thereon as selected". Independent claim 14 as amended also recites, *inter alia*, a sales facilitating method for caps wherein "different perspective views of one cap design include at least two views on which any created text may be displayed".

Finally, independent claim 19 recites a computer network server for facilitating sales, including a processor generating a visual representation of a user selected design element on an object represented by a selected display icon wherein "at least two of said perspective views of each three-dimensional shape are adapted to include said selected design element in the generated visual representation".

Thus, all of the pending claims (independent claims 3, 14 and 19 and the other claims variously depending therefrom) are submitted to clearly distinguish from the new references. Accordingly, all of the claims are believed to be allowable. Early notification to that effect is respectfully requested..

Respectfully submitted,

WOOD, PHILLIPS, KATZ,
CLARK & MORTIMER

By _____
Jeffrey L. Clark
Reg. No. 29,141

August 12, 2005

500 West Madison Street
Suite 3800
Chicago, IL 60661-2511
(312/876-1800